

PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD'S DECISION

APPELLANT: Renato Tonelli
DOCKET NO.: 04-23559.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 04-10-109-006-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Renato Tonelli, the appellant, by attorney Rusty A. Payton of the Law Offices of Rusty A. Payton, P.C., Chicago, Illinois; and the Cook County Board of Review.

The subject property is an 80-year old, one and one-half story stucco dwelling containing 2,120 square feet of living area with a full, unfinished basement and a two-car detached garage. According to the appellant, the dwelling is a one-story dwelling containing 1,356 square feet of living area.

The appellant submitted evidence before the Property Tax Appeal Board claiming unequal treatment in the assessment process as the basis of the appeal. In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted a grid analysis detailing three suggested comparable properties. On the appellant's map, the comparables are located approximately one and one-quarter miles to one and one-half miles from the subject. The comparables are one-story frame and masonry dwellings that are 50 or 51 years old. One comparable has a partial basement; one has a full basement; and one has an unfinished basement. Each comparable has central air conditioning, and two have fireplaces. Photographs supplied by the appellant indicate that at least one comparable has a garage. The dwellings have living areas that contain 1,068 to 1,571 square feet, and their improvement assessments range from \$13.42 to \$14.73 per square foot. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$19.60 per square foot based on 1,356 square feet of living area; however, no evidence in the record supports that square footage. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

(Continued on Next Page)

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds no change in the assessment of the property as established by the Cook County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND:	\$	6,665
IMPR.:	\$	26,577
TOTAL:	\$	33,242

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

PTAB/BRW

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's assessment was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review offered property characteristic sheets and a spreadsheet detailing four suggested comparable properties that are located in close proximity of the subject. The comparables are one-story or one and one-half story frame or stucco dwellings that are 18 to 74 years old. Two comparables have partial, unfinished basements, and two have full, unfinished basements. Two comparables have central air conditioning, and three have a fireplace. Each comparable has a two-car garage. The dwellings have living areas that contain 1,436 to 2,182 square feet, and improvement assessments that range from \$17.73 to \$18.88 per square foot. According to the board of review, the subject property has an improvement assessment of \$12.54 per square foot. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After reviewing the record and considering the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal. The Property Tax Appeal Board further finds that a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted. The appellant's argument was unequal treatment in the assessment process. The Illinois Supreme Court has held that taxpayers who object to an assessment on the basis of lack of uniformity bear the burden of proving the disparity of assessment valuations by clear and convincing evidence. Kankakee County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 131 Ill.2d 1 (1989). The evidence must demonstrate a consistent pattern of assessment inequities within the assessment jurisdiction. After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds the appellant has not overcome this burden.

Both parties presented assessment data on a total of seven equity comparables. According to the board of review, the subject property is a one and one-half story dwelling with 2,120 square feet. According to the appellant, the dwelling contains 1,356 square feet. The best evidence available to resolve this is the property characteristic sheet for the subject property provided by the board of review and a photograph of the subject property provided by the appellant. Both appear to indicate that the subject property is a one and one-half story dwelling with 2,120 square feet of living area. Based upon this determination, the appellant's comparables differed significantly in design and size from the subject. In addition, the appellant's comparables differed significantly in age and location. As a result, the appellant's comparables received reduced weight in the Board's analysis. The board of review's comparables three and four differed significantly in size from the subject; comparables two, three, and four differed in design and exterior construction; and comparables two and four also differed significantly in age. As

a result, these three board of review comparables also received reduced weight in the Board's analysis. The board of review's comparable one was the most similar to the subject in location, age, and physical characteristics. This comparable had an improvement assessment of \$17.73 per square foot that supports the subject's improvement assessment of \$12.54 per square foot. After considering adjustments and the differences in both parties' suggested comparables when compared to the subject property, the Board finds the subject's per square foot improvement assessment is supported by the most comparable properties contained in the record, and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

As a result of this analysis, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds the appellant has not adequately demonstrated that the subject dwelling was inequitably assessed by clear and convincing evidence, and a reduction is not warranted.

This is a final administrative decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board are subject to review in the Circuit Court or Appellate Court under the provisions of the Administrative Review Law (735 ILCS 5/3-101 et seq.) and section 16-195 of the Property Tax Code.



Chairman



Member



Member



Member



Member

DISSENTING: _____

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

As Clerk of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board and the keeper of the Records thereof, I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and complete Final Administrative Decision of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board issued this date in the above entitled appeal, now of record in this said office.

Date: September 28, 2007



Clerk of the Property Tax Appeal Board

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code provides in part:

"If the Property Tax Appeal Board renders a decision lowering the assessment of a particular parcel after the deadline for filing

complaints with the Board of Review or after adjournment of the session of the Board of Review at which assessments for the subsequent year are being considered, the taxpayer may, within 30 days after the date of written notice of the Property Tax Appeal Board's decision, appeal the assessment for the subsequent year directly to the Property Tax Appeal Board."

In order to comply with the above provision, YOU MUST FILE A PETITION AND EVIDENCE WITH THE PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE ENCLOSED DECISION IN ORDER TO APPEAL THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEAR.

Based upon the issuance of a lowered assessment by the Property Tax Appeal Board, the refund of paid property taxes is the responsibility of your County Treasurer. Please contact that office with any questions you may have regarding the refund of paid property taxes.